

Attorney Docket No.: SONY-50P3806

The

ADEMA		IN THE UNITED	STATES PATER	NI AND I KADEMIA	KK OFFICE
envelop	e bearing				United States Postal Service in an 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,
Date of Deposit	08/1		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Signature of the Person Making the Deposit:	Julia Villams
In re A	Applicati	on of: Gina C. Euba	nks		U
Applic	ation No	o.: 09/661,578		Examiner: Dinh, K	<b>:.</b>
Filed:	09/14	/00		Art Unit: 2151	
Confir	mation l	No.: 9174			
For: I	NTERN	ET STRAWMAN AI	ND USER INTERFAC	CE THEREFOR	
P.O. E	3ox 1450	r for Patents ) A 22313-1450	REPLY BRI	IEF TRANSMITTAL	
1.	Trans	mitted herewith is a	n amendment for this		
XT	ransmit (3	ted herewith is a res sheets)	sponse to an office a	ction for the above ident	ified patent application.
	ransmit Other:	ted herewith are	sheets of su	bstitute formal drawings	
2.	Applic	ant is other than a s	small entity		
			Extensio	n of Term	
3.	The p	roceedings herein a	are for a patent applic	cation and the provisions	of 37 C.F.R. 1.136 apply.
(a)	[]			time under 37 C.F.R. 1. al number of months che	
		Extension [ ] one m [ ] two m [ ] three [ ] four m [ ] five m	nonth onths months nonths	Fee \$120.00 \$450.00 \$1,020.00 \$1,590.00 \$2,160.00 Fee \$	
If an a	dditiona	extension of time is	s required, please co	onsider this a petition the	refor.
(b)	[X]	being made to pro		ity that applicant has ina	ever, this conditional petition is divertently overlooked the

1 of 2

Attorney Docket No.: SONY-50P3806

## **Fee Calculation**

4. The fee for claims (37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)-(d)) has been calculated as shown below:

(for other than a small entity)					
Fee Items	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number of Claims Previously Paid For	Present Extra Claims	Fee Rate	Total
Total Claims	30	- 30 =	0	x \$50.00	\$0.00
Independent Claims	3	- 3 =	0	x \$200.00	\$0.00
Multiple Dependent Claim Fee (one or more, first added by this \$360.00 \$0.00 amendment)					\$0.00
Total Fees			\$0.00		

#### **PAYMENT OF FEES**

5.	The full fee due in connection with this communication is	
	provided as follows:	

[	х ]	The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.: 23-0085.  A <u>duplicate copy</u> of this authorization is enclosed.
[	]	A check in the amount of \$
[	]	Charge any fees required or credit any overpayments associated with this filing to Deposit Account No.: 23-0085.

Please direct all correspondence concerning the above-identified application to the following address:

#### **WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP**

Two North Market Street, Third Floor San Jose, California 95113 (408) 938-9060 Customer No: 45589

Respectfully submitted,

Date:	8/14/06	By: W. Zarlan	
		William A. Zarbis Reg. No. 46,120	



# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant:

Eubanks, G.

Patent Application

Application No.:

09/661,578

Art Unit:

2151

Filing Date:

September 14, 2000

Examiner:

Dinh, K.

For: INTERNET STRAWMAN AND USER INTERFACE THEREFOR

### Reply Brief

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on June 12, 2006, Appellant respectfully submits the following remarks.

#### REMARKS

The Appellant is submitting the following remarks in response to the Examiner's Answer. In these remarks, the Appellant is addressing certain arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer. While only certain arguments are addressed in this Reply Brief, this should not be construed that the Appellant agrees with the other arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer.

Appellant objects to the statement on page 7 of the Examiner's Answer, to the effect that Appellant's arguments address only one reference and not the combination of the two cited references (Herman and Philyaw). For each claim limitation at issue, Appellant argues in the Appeal Brief that the claim limitation is not shown or suggested in the first of the two references, that the same claim limitation is not shown or suggested in the second of the two references, and that the same claim limitation is not shown or suggested in the combination of the two references.

Regarding the limitation "said intermediary conducting said transaction with said vendor ... utilizing information about said intermediary" recited in Claims 1, 11 and 21, Appellant first addresses the Herman reference, starting on page 4 the Appeal Brief, because the Herman reference is relied upon as teaching this limitation. However, on page 6 of the Appeal Brief, this limitation is discussed considering the Philyaw reference in combination with the Herman reference.

Regarding the limitation "without disclosing said personal information about said subscriber to said vendor" also recited in Claims 1, 11 and 21, the Examiner admits that this limitation is not taught by Herman. On page 6 of the Appeal Brief, this limitation is discussed considering the Philyaw reference in combination with the Herman reference.

Thus, the rejection of each these limitations is refuted in the Appeal Brief considering the combination of the Herman and Philyaw references.

In light of the above remarks as well as the arguments presented in the Appeal Brief, Appellant respectfully asserts that either or both of these limitations are patentably distinct over the cited prior art references and that a rejection of Claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should not be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 8 14, 2006

Willia∕m A. ∄arbis

Registration No.: 46,120

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Two North Market Street Third Floor

San Jose, CA 95113